

1303 5-

House of Commons Debates

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT'S REPLY

TO THE

BUDGET SPEECH

Delivered in the House of Commons, Feb. 29th, 1884.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.
Mr. Speaker, having been prevented by an express provision of an Act of Parliament to that intent made and provided, from being present last year when the hon. gentleman made his financial statement, I am not quite as familiar as I could wish to be with the course of the discussion in 1883. But I will venture to say, although I was not present then, that I have very little doubt that the hon. gentleman on that occasion took a very different tone, and struck a very different attitude from that which he has assumed to-night. Sir, it was not for nothing that the hon. gentleman in the present instance, found it necessary to apologize and defend, and excuse as far as he could, as well as he knew how, the policy of which he has been the exponent for so long.

Some Remarkable Admissions.

He undoubtedly made some remarkable admissions to which I shall direct your attention and the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman told us, and told us truly enough, that it is not possible for his policy to avert over-production and consequent injury to manufacturers or the loss of wages to their unfortunate employees; nor could his policy avert poor harvests, or give us a larger market for lumber, or

prevent a decrease in the value of goods, nor could it check over-importations. All true, Mr. Speaker. But why is it that these economic truths are now dawning for the first time upon the hon. gentleman and his followers? Were not those things as true when my honorable friend beside me, (Mr. Mackenzie) presided over the affairs of Canada as they are to-day? Were any allowances then made by—not the hon. gentleman who was at that time snug and safe at Fredericton while other hon. gentlemen were bearing the heat and burthen of the day—not by the hon. gentlemen, I say, but by the hon. gentleman who I see sitting beside him. What excuse were they willing to make, for my honorable friend when precisely these very things occurred, only in a far greater degree, in a far more intensified degree, and when in consequence of those things, my hon. friend was obliged to struggle for some considerable time with financial difficulties. Sir, I hail it as a sign of improvement that the hon. gentleman at last, after a long time, is waking up to what the country is also waking up, that this policy, whatever it may be, is no panacea, that it won't save the country hard times, that it won't save the single man. Now Sir, the honorable gentleman admitted some things; but the honorable gentleman has an old habit of not telling us, when

he makes these financial statements, all the expenditure which we are likely to incur in consequence of his policy. On the present occasion he told us, it is true, what we could guess without his telling us, that, in addition to the estimates we have here, doubtless large supplementary estimates are going to be brought down. We are accustomed to that. It is a misfortune—a misfortune from which I admit neither Government was quite free—that besides the facts detailed on the first occasion of making the Budget statement, there are generally other facts not then detailed, involving considerable additions to our expenditure. In my time, I can only say, I tried to keep those expenditures as low as possible. I was not always successful, any more than the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman gave us a hint that probably a million more than the estimates would be required. He dealt in the most gingerly fashion possible with the other question of how many millions this railway extension policy of which he spoke was to cost—of what additional interest charge to the country it would involve. Now, surely the hon. gentleman, when making the financial statement, could tell us whether we are going to spend \$4,000,000, or \$8,000,000, or \$12,000,000, under the guise of a railway extension policy. Surely we ought to know that. Surely the hon. gentleman will not refuse to tell us roughly—I do not ask that he should tell us exactly; but surely he can tell us within a million or two—what this railway extension policy is likely to cost us. It is a question of interest. It has been a question of interest to a great many of the supporters of the hon. gentleman, and I think we ought to know what the final figure is to be. How many millions? Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways will tell me how many millions. We have been dealing with so many millions lately, that a few millions more or less can not in the least discompose the hon. gentleman. I see they do not; but surely, to gratify my natural curiosity, he will tell me what is the bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In good time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the time. Surely we ought to know. How many more millions are going to be added to the debt of the country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that they are not dealing quite fairly with the House and the country, or their own supporters, in keeping that interesting information at the back of their heads. Now, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is going to repeat the process which he carried out in 1873. Then I recollect, he brought down a Budget statement; but, although he must have been well aware of what was in contemplation, he did not tell us, if my memory serves me, by \$3,000,000 a year, what was to be the total expenditure under the new obligations which the country was going to. Sir, I do not suppose he is going to add \$3,000,000 in the present instance to our expenditure; but he is going to add a considerable sum, and what the sum is, I repeat, we ought to know.

The Spirit of Prophecy.

Now, I would like to have heard from the hon. gentleman a little more fully, a justification of the present enormous taxation. I would like to have been informed, a little more fully than he has condescended to tell us, what his policy is going to be in the event of a large reduction of imports: and I would like that for two reasons. The hon. gentleman knows—indeed he admits—that it is a thing very likely to happen; and more, he tells us that it is very desirable. The year of all years which he held up, and always has held up as a model year, is that especial year in which our exports slightly exceeded our imports. Well, Sir, if his policy is going to be as successful in the future as it has been in the past, if our imports are going to be reduced so as to just balance our exports, then it is clear, on the hon. gentleman's own showing, that we must expect a very large reduction of revenue; and we have some right to know how he proposes to

July 1961

3.00

Cartwright

meet that reduction, in such event. Sir, the hon. gentleman, in dealing with this question, and with the recent condition of the country, was in a difficulty, and a rather serious difficulty. By his own language, on the last occasion of his making a financial statement, he had practically estopped himself from looking the situation in the face. On that occasion the spirit of prophecy descended on the hon. gentleman—or rather, I should say a spirit of prophecy descended on him. There are differences in spirit which probably the hon. gentleman did not understand. He was good enough to tell us then that we need take no fear for the future—carry on all sail, quoth the hon. gentleman, I am at the helm, and you are safe for seven years. Now, Sir, he has given several reasons for the depression which exists. I will give another: It was the misplaced confidence which his supporters in the House and in the country put in the hon. gentleman's prophetic vision on that occasion. Sir, I was a little at a loss to understand exactly what the hon. gentleman's speech implied in the matter of depression. One-half of his speech, as I understand it, was taken up in showing that there was no depression, and the other half in assigning reasons for the existence of the depression. As my hon. friend knows, I am not a profound lawyer, but it does occur to me that there is such a thing as an objection to a plea for multifariousness. Are we in a state of depression, or are we not? I can hardly make out, from the speech of the hon. gentleman, what particular line he takes on the present occasion. It would not trouble me whether he took the one or the other, for this reason—that I can neither agree with his statement that we are not in a state of depression, nor with his explanation as to the causes which have brought about that depression. Sir, I do not believe, that there is a man of business in this House or in the country outside who will say, that to-day Canada is in a very satisfactory condition, commercially or financially. At this present moment, as the hon. gentleman must

know, men are apprehensive, men or not anxious to enter into new enterprises. I am sorry to say that the old enterprises are not giving as good an account of themselves as we could wish. Now, I say there is no sufficient cause for that. The check which we have encountered is apparently a slight one. One particular crop in one-half of a Province—true, a very important Province—has been a failure; but I say that under ordinary circumstances that failure should not have produced the state of apprehension or the state of depression which undoubtedly does exist to a very great extent in this country. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman that it is beginning to dawn on men's minds, even on the minds of his own supporters, that high taxes do not insure national prosperity, and that wise statesmen will count the cost before they throw tens of millions of dollars away to aid a company that may get into difficulties. Now we will take some of the tests that the hon. gentleman has in former times, aye, and to-night, applied, and we will see to what extent those tests indicate the present condition of the country. The hon. gentleman spent a good deal of time in explaining how and why it was that the shrinkage in bank stocks was not to be taken as a matter of serious moment. I do not consider them myself as a matter of extreme moment, but I point this out, that when those stocks were high the hon. gentleman took credit for their being high; he declared that was one of the results of his policy. These stocks have shrunk to a very large extent within the last twelve months. True, there has been a rally in one or two of the most important of them within the last few weeks, and perhaps certain Resolutions which lately passed through this House might explain to those who wish to know why those one or two particulars stocks have rapidly ascended within the last fortnight or month. But the fact remains, that the stocks, as a whole, are many millions of dollars less in selling value to-day than they were this time twelve months. Why, even the

Bank of Montreal stock sold on the 13th of February, last year, at 208½ and to-day, according to the hon. gentleman, it is about 188 or 189, I forget which. There is a large shrinkage there, even taking the present figures, if he likes. Then the hon. gentleman just now alluded to the number of bankruptcies. I do not in the slightest degree consider that a matter of congratulation, but at the same time, as the hon. gentleman chooses to bring the question up, I may remind him that according to one authority, the amount of bankruptcies in Canada was \$15,949,000, for 1883, and according to another authority, \$22,155,000. If, as I suspect, the latter included the failure of the unfortunate Exchange Bank, I am inclined to think that the latter sum is the fairer and more proper one to take in estimating the extent of the bankruptcies in Canada in 1883. The hon. gentleman, as far as my recollection serves me, was not correct in saying that the bankruptcies in 1876, 1877 or 1878 were double even the smaller sum mentioned. I speak from recollection, but I am positive that in none of those years did they reach \$30,000,000 or \$32,000,000, which would be double of \$15,949,000. I will not, at this moment, dwell on this other test which the hon. gentleman gave last year—the prosperity of the manufacturers or the contentment of the people. I may have more to say on both those heads before we sit down, but allow me, Sir, to tell the hon. gentleman that he is very much mistaken if he believes that, at this moment, in the principal cities of Canada the people, and particularly the employees of manufacturers are either prosperous or contented. I say it with sorrow and regret, that in the chief city of Ontario it has been stated publicly and it has not been contradicted—I believe that it is a fact—that several thousands of people were indebted to charity for a part of their subsistence during the present winter. There are other tests, however on which the hon. gentleman is fond of dwelling, and to which we shall come after a little while. There is the test

of the increase of population and the increase of traffic on our railways. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that for months back the trade of our principal railways has shown a great and alarming decrease. That surely is not, in his opinion, or in that of any other hon. gentleman, a proof that this country is at this moment in a very prosperous condition.

Increased Trade with Great Britain.

But I desire to say a few words on a matter to which the hon. gentleman alluded in this connection, and to which, if I am not mistaken, some of his colleagues have very often alluded, and that is, the extent to which this hon. gentleman's policy has increased our trade with Great Britain and diminished our trade with the United States. Now I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman made that statement with any intention to deceive the House. I do not accuse him of doing that. But I say that the hon. gentleman was hardly fair in making a comparison between the year 1883 and the year 1876, in the matter of the trade of the two countries. One was a prosperous year; the other was a year of considerable depression. However I would pass that over, but I will call the attention of the House to this, that when the hon. gentleman spoke of the imports from the United States in the one year and compare them with the imports from the United States in the other, he wholly and entirely forgot to inform the House that under the present Tariff, imposed by himself, the nominal imports entered for our consumption from the United States almost exactly represent our true imports, whereas, in 1876, as everybody familiar with the Trade and Navigation Returns knows, our nominal imports from the United States include a great many millions of dollars for goods that were entered *in transitu*, and simply passed through this country on their way to Great Britain. That fact vitiates entirely the hon. gentleman's comparisons from first to last. I will go back a little fur-

her. I will take the year 1873, which is a fair year of comparison with this year of 1888, and as this point has been made a great deal of by the hon. gentlemen in this House, and on the other side of the Atlantic, I call the special attention of the House to the effect which the present policy has on our trade with Great Britain and the United States. In 1873, a year which compared fairly with the year 1883, our imports from Great Britain were \$68,522,000; our true imports from the United States in the same year, deducting those goods which passed *in transitu*, although they were, under the old form, entered for consumption, were \$40,488,000. Our true exports to Great Britain, of our own products of the same year, were \$31,486,000; our true exports to the United States of our own produce, deducting short returns, were \$37,262,000. What were the facts last year—facts well worth knowing? Our imports from Great Britain were \$52,000,000; our exports to Great Britain, of our own produce, were \$39,672,000. Our imports from the United States in these goods, which really and actually entered into consumption, were \$56,000,000; our sales to the United States were \$35,963,000, as before, striking out short returns. Now, Sir, what is the result? Why, the result is this, that as between the years 1873 and 1883, we purchased from Great Britain \$16,500,000 less in 1883 than in 1873, and we purchased from the United States \$15,500,000 more than we did in 1873. We sell to Great Britain, of articles of our own production, very nearly \$8,000,000 more, and we sell to the United States \$1,250,000 less; so that if it does matter particularly, the trade between ourselves and Great Britain and ourselves and the United States is, at the expiration of the decade of ten years, \$40,000,000 worse under the hon. gentleman's policy than it was in 1873. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that I am taking those statements from his own Trade and Navigation Returns. He knows that they cannot be controverted, and that they do not show the whole of the facts, because it is well

known to everybody that, in 1873, under the old policy, we carried on a large contraband trade with the United States, selling them several millions of dollars' worth of goods that did not appear in our returns, and now, under his policy, the United States sell us several millions of dollars' worth of goods that do not appear in their returns, or ours either. Sir, I do not insist very much on the question, because I do not regard it, as the hon. gentleman appears to do, of very great moment. but it is of moment in this way, that the hon. gentleman here and the hon. gentleman's colleagues elsewhere have pointed triumphantly to the facts, as they stated them, as proof that this was a Tariff which favoured trade with Great Britain, and to a considerable extent diminished trade with the United States. Now the House, gentlemen on this side and gentlemen on that side, can judge for themselves how just was the boast that our present policy had increased our trade with Great Britain, had diminished our trade with the United States. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the amount of deposits in savings-banks. Now, as far as it goes, that is a good sign. I am not going to dispute that position with the hon. gentleman. But I will call the attention of the House to one or two facts. First of all I call the attention of the House to this, that a good deal of these extra deposits in the savings bank were obtained by the hon. gentleman by paying interest largely in excess of the current market rate. When the banks would only give 3 per cent., the hon. gentleman continued to give 4. That is to say, he continued to pay more for money at call, about one-third more, than those who were dealing in that commodity thought it was worth. Moreover, it is a great mistake to suppose that the money which we borrow from the people only costs us 4 per cent. All the expenses of management, amounting from a quarter to a half per cent. on the present deposits, have to be added. Moreover, if he adopts the ordinary rules of banking, if he preserves in gold, as he ought to do, a sufficient reserve to meet

unexpected calls which may come upon him, a considerable sum would have to be kept in hand—not on deposit in the banks, that would not answer in such a case, but in gold—without paying interest. So that, altogether, the result would be that the hon. gentleman is borrowing money at call, and pays about 25 per cent more for it than he would if he had borrowed it for a long term from the public here or in England. Then, there is another consideration. The hon. gentleman, it is true, has got some \$26,000,000, or more perhaps, from the people of this country at call, and a large sum, also at call, in the shape of the note circulation. Now, I do not regard the note circulation as likely to be a serious source of embarrassment, but it is quite on the cards that the hon. gentleman one of these days may be called upon for a considerable portion of these deposits. I do not say that it will happen. None of us can venture to say what will occur, but I say there is a chance of such an occurrence, and under no circumstances is it wise or prudent to borrow a considerable sum of money at call, and to pay considerably more for it than you can obtain the money for for a fixed period of definite duration. Then, I am not at all sure that the fact that the people of Canada are not able to employ that large sum of money to better advantage than 4 per cent., is at all a proof that things are in a prosperous condition. I would rather say it was a proof that we were approaching the stationary state, that there was a difficulty in employing money in Canada to good advantage. I am not sure that a wise statesman would bring forward the amount of money on deposit at 4 per cent. in savings banks in a country like Canada as a proof that the people were prospering as he would desire them to do. If they were, it would be taken out and used in other ways, in building up towns and cities and developing the country in a hundred different ways, and it would be better employed, if the country were really prosperous, than in being handed over to the hon. gentleman and by him invested in more or less permanent forms, from which he

may find it rather difficult, at some time or other, to recover it.

Repudiate Animosity to Manufacturers.

Now, I agree with the hon. gentleman in one respect. The hon. gentleman said that this was a fit time to review our position, a fit time to consider the platforms of the two parties in this country with respect to its financial management. As I understand it, the platform of the Liberal party was, and is, that it is the duty of a wise Government to keep down the taxes and to keep down the expenditure of a country, in the position of Canada, as low as it fairly can. We say also, Sir, that it is the interest of the people of Canada that, so far as the Government can make or keep it so, Canada should be a cheap country to live in, a country where a man's wages should go far, a country where a man could obtain a good return for the money he has to lay out, and, for that reason, we say it is a folly to impose heavy taxation on the great mass of the community for the temporary benefit of a small portion of the manufacturing interest. I repudiate most utterly, for myself and for my friends here, every imputation that we have the smallest animosity towards the manufactures of Canada. I repudiate that entirely. I say that we are the true friends of the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada. I say we are their true friends, and I say that everything that tends to impoverish the bulk of the people, who are the customers of the great mass of the manufacturers, tends to endamage the great mass of the manufacturers. I say that the hon. gentleman's policy is trebly foolish in this respect, in view of the fact that Canada has an enormous stake in developing the great country to the north-west of us; I say that his policy is especially adapted to retard and impede that development, and to put every possible obstacle in the way of the unfortunate settler who may trust his fortunes in the North-West under the present Government. In all these points, the policy of the

hon. gentleman, as defined by himself and by his colleagues, is directly in opposition to ours. They hold that it is well to heap up taxes and to heap up expenditure; they hold, and the Minister of Finance, has often explained, that it is the interest of the people that things in Canada should be dear; they hold that it is the interest of the great mass of the population that a small number of persons should be subsidized at their expense; they hold that the way to help and to develop the North-West is to put on taxes, and to make the small capital at the settler's command go as short a way as possible. On all these points we have ever taken issue with the hon. gentleman—we take issue now, and we will continue to take issue, and we will do our best to explain to the people on all occasions—how exceedingly they have been deceived by the sophistries, not so much of the hon. gentleman as of those who sit beside him, and who, as I said, succeeded five or six years ago in converting the people for the time to their view of the matter. Now, Sir, I will say one thing for these gentlemen, they have lived up to their creed, they have done their utmost to raise taxation to the highest point, they have done their utmost to raise the expenditure of Canada to the highest point, and it is not the first time, either. Now, we have had five years' experience, and I say as well as the hon. gentlemen, that the time has come when we can see what we have really done, and also at what cost it has been done. Sir, the hon. gentleman defines his policy as a great experiment. He said the truth. It was a great experiment, and it was an experiment which at the time it was tried had everything in its favour. We had hard times—by no fault of the late Administration; we had the example of the United States, which no doubt had a very great influence on many of our people; we had the clamour of a small and influential class who saw their own private interest in assisting the hon. gentlemen; they were able to make magnificent promises; promises cost nothing, and they made them freely, and

therefore they did succeed in persuading the people of Canada to try the experiment which, as the hon. gentleman says they have just been putting into action. Then, when the experiment was tried, they were favoured by a rather remarkable combination of accidents. I do not suppose the honorable Minister of Finance, although he has said some rather strange things, although he has advanced some rather curious theories—I do not suppose that he, although I have no doubt some of his followers are quite capable of saying it, and perhaps of believing it—I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is going to tell us that the fact that in 1879, and shortly after, money became extraordinarily cheap and plentiful in New York, in London, Paris, Amsterdam, and almost in all the great centres in commerce in the world, was produced by the National Policy adopted in Canada; and yet, Sir, that was a very important factor in the condition of the people of Canada, that undoubtedly proved a great benefit, and they reaped a great advantage from the fact that money at that time had become cheap and plentiful in all the money centres of the world. Almost at that same time, there took place, as every man knows, a great revival in the United States. Now I am always happy to agree with the hon. gentleman if I can; it is not often, I am sorry to say, that I can do so; and I entirely concur with him in saying that the prosperity of Canada is very intimately connected with the prosperity of the United States; but I do not believe, Sir, that the fact that we imposed very heavy taxes in Canada had a great deal to do with the other fact, that trade and commerce throughout the length and breadth of the United States revived in 1879, and I hardly think the hon. gentleman himself will venture to say so. Then, Sir, added to these things, we had, as everybody knows, extraordinary good harvests and extraordinary good prices—produced by the National Policy, were they? No; but by the fact that, unfortunately in England, Ireland, and on the continent of Europe, they were bad

harvests at the identical time that we had good ones, so that we had at once unusually good prices and an unusual quantity of things to sell. Then, Sir, the North-West was opened up, and beyond all doubt for a time that gave a great impetus to trade and business in Canada. Had it been wisely and well done, had it been wisely and well administered, it would have continued to give a great impetus up to this time. And Sir, last but by no means least, the hon. gentleman had the advantage of coming into office and reaping the fruits of five years of honest and prudent Administration under my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie,

Advantage of five years good Government.

Sir, I am astonished at the ingratitude of hon. gentlemen opposite—as regards myself, I do not expect much gratitude from them—I waived my claims; but they ought to be grateful to my hon. friend beside me. If the hon. gentleman supposes for one moment, if the hon. Minister of Customs supposes that I am here as a craven apologist, he makes a great mistake. I am here not merely to defend but to justify and to maintain the whole conduct of my hon. friend during his Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. And to defend your own conduct?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am prepared to do both.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not very generous to do that.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not claim credit for generosity. This is not a question of generosity, but of fact and truth. Sir, I do not deny there was depression at the time of my hon. friend's Administration. There necessarily was depression, but there was ten times more in the United States than in Canada at that time.

Mr. Mackenzie's Mistakes.

I do not deny that my hon. friend made mistakes; I do not claim for him that he is infallible, I grant he made

mistakes, and more, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what were the mistakes my hon. friend made. My hon. friend, in the excess of his zeal for the public service, greatly over-exerted his physical strength; that was one mistake. My hon. friend, in the excess of the kindness of his heart, was far too generous to hon. gentlemen opposite; that was another mistake. I admit, also, that in the excess of his patriotism, he somewhat over-estimated the sense of honesty and intelligence of a certain portion of his countrymen. Now, Sir, those are faults which I will admit on the part of my hon. friend; and to do justice to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I will further say that they are faults that there is not the slightest danger any of them, collectively or individually, will ever commit. Sir, I am prepared to maintain, here or elsewhere, that whatever my hon. friend's mistakes may have been, his policy was substantially wise and just and good, and that it would have been infinitely better for Canada had it been carried out from that day to this. Sir, it was a great misfortune that, prior to 1873, Canada neglected the warnings and the cautions which were given to her by that hon. gentleman and his friends. It was Canada's folly that, in 1878, she held him responsible, because those identical results had occurred, which he had showed must occur in certain contingencies, if those warnings were neglected or disregarded. It has not been the first time—it won't be the last—when men like my hon. friend, for doing all that mortal men could do for the benefit of their country, have found themselves treated with ingratitude by the country.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It was your friends who turned him out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the people made a great mistake in deposing my hon. friend in 1878; and I will tell the hon. gentleman more, that perhaps in his heart of hearts he is beginning to think that too. Now, Sir, how stands the case to-day? The hon. gentleman has given us his explanations. He tells us, if I took down his words

ari-
of
our
was
to t
tru
see
tha
of l
the
in
\$18,
not
depr
—I
but t
of lu
than
that
whic
time
and
agree
the n
and
the E

Canad
no do
sons a
great
been
unjust
Sir, b
ment l
in man
in so s
a very
will ha
has be
has tak
at larg
of ho
fourth
which I
for wh
gentlem
fifth ca
for whi
and its

aright, that one cause, among other things, of the present depression, is the fact that our lumber industry is not as good as it was. Now I will just call his attention to this. It may be true, I dare say it is true, that during the ensuing six months our lumber industry may slacken, but I see in the returns laid on the Table, that whereas, during the last six months of 1882, we had exported of products of the forest, \$18,090,000, we had exported in the last six months of 1883, \$18,183,000 worth. Now, Sir, that cannot be urged as proof of any present depression. There may be risk in future—I am not prepared to say there is not; but the fact that we sold \$100,000 worth of lumber up to 1st January, 1884, more than up to 1st January, 1883, shows that that is not a cause of the distress which has occurred up to the present time. He talks also of over-production and of the poor harvest. Well, I will agree that all those things are factors in the matter. But there are other causes, and I will tell the hon. gentleman and the House what those causes are.

Reasons for Depression.

Canada to-day is distressed, there is no doubt of it, and I am afraid the reasons are these. First of all, because a great deal of the money of the people has been taken from them by excessive, unjust and oppressive taxation. Next, Sir, because the policy of the Government has caused a great lock up of capital in manufactures which were not wanted in so small a country as this. Then, Sir, a very considerable loss, as to which I will have a good deal to say hereafter, has been caused by the emigration which has taken place from Ontario and Canada at large, also largely caused by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The fourth cause is the locking up of capital which has taken place in the North-West, for which also I will show those hon. gentlemen are responsible. And the fifth cause is the increased cost of living, for which the hon. gentleman's Tariff and its indirect results are seriously

responsible. I do not deny that the poor harvest in western Ontario has done its share; but I say that of all those causes, far the greater number and the more important ones are directly attributable to the policy of the present Government. Now, Sir, we come to the question of the first cause—the onerous taxation—and here there are a few considerations to be presented to the House. There is the nominal taxation, the amount paid into the Treasury; there is, in the next place, the amount taken out of the pockets of the people, which does not go into the Treasury, but which is paid to a few hundreds of men scattered throughout the Dominion. The hon. Finance Minister disputed some of the assertions of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) as to the extent of that. I do not suppose any intelligent protectionist can be found who will deny the plain and simple fact that, whether protection in itself be good or be bad, whether protection does or does not make us an adequate return—from the very nature of the case, protection must be costly, from the very nature of the case if you impose a taxation of 20, 30 or 40 per cent., as the case may be, to exclude certain goods, and cause others to be manufactured in the country, just in proportion as you increase the manufacture you must impose a large additional tax on the people. I do not suppose the Minister of Finance himself will venture to deny that proposition; I am sure those of his supporters who have looked into the question will not venture to do so. Now, I am not going to speak of the indirect effects of protection; I am going to speak of the things to which the hon. gentleman has alluded himself. And first of all, we will take the article of sugar. The hon. gentleman says that sugar is very cheap to-day. It may be so. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that it is cheaper to-day than it was four or five years ago. It may be so. That does not affect the argument at all. Our position is this: under the Tariff of the hon. gentleman, sugar is much dearer than it need be, after deducting the sum which goes into the Treasury. To

day, I am informed by men of high standing in the trade, you could put down at Montreal, free of duty, three classes of sugar which are most in demand in Canada, at the rate of \$5 per 100 lbs. I am informed by those gentlemen also, that if they buy those sugars from Canadian refineries they have to pay \$8 per 100 lbs., being an excess of \$3. We consumed in 1883, 152,000,000 lbs. of sugar. I will allow a large percentage, 12,000,000, to go into the accounts for the waste in converting that into such sugar as the people require; but every man can see for himself that if you could buy that sugar at 5 cents per lb., duty free, and are obliged to pay 3 cents more to the refiner, what the cost to the people of Canada that extra 3 cents per lb. is. It is \$4,500,000. Of that sum \$2,467,000 went into the Treasury, and \$1,500,000 was lost. That is the state of the case now under the hon. gentleman's Tariff. So, Sir, we find this result. In 1878 we imported 108,000,000 pounds. Our duty then was largely below our duty now. Our duty then was about 25 per cent less than it is to-day on the grades of sugar which go into consumption. In that time we have added about 30 per cent to our consumption, and we have added 25 per cent to our duty, and the result is that we have received \$100,000 less money. We obtained \$2,567,000 in 1878, with a lower scale of duties, on 108,000,000 lbs. of sugar; on 152,000,000 lbs. in 1883 we received \$2,476,000, although we have added largely to the duties. There is an illustration, if the hon. gentleman wants it. I do not mean to say there may not be some counterbalancing advantages to be offered, that some trade may not be brought to Montreal by that policy. That is not the point. I am not arguing whether protection is good or not. But that protection costs the general public many millions more than actually goes into the Treasury. The same is true, though not to the same extent, of coal. Coal is a raw material to manufacturers. Every man knows when you place a duty on that article that the amount paid into the

Treasury does not measure the amount taken out of the pockets of the people. Every one knows that if the hon. gentleman has succeeded, as he thinks he has, and perhaps he has, in causing about \$20,000,000 worth of textile goods to be manufactured here, presumably, giving employment to 14,000 or 15,000 persons, that has only been done by imposing a duty, probable of 30 per cent., certainly not less than 25 per cent., on all consumers of the goods. And therefore, I say in estimating the taxation of this country you must add many millions to the sum actually paid into the Treasury in fact we must add an amount which we cannot satisfactorily measure. The hon. gentleman is in this dilemma. If he disputes these figures, if he thinks he does not give employment to 14,000 or 15,000 persons, that he has not succeeded in causing our manufacturers to produce that quantity of goods, what then becomes of the home market which was to recompense the rest of the people for the amount of taxation to which they were to be subjected. Let the hon. gentleman make his selection. I repeat that I am not arguing as to whether protection is good or bad, but simply as to what it actually costs the people of the country.

Canada Heavily Taxed.

The result is is this: Canada to-day is a very heavily taxed country. There are other countries more heavily taxed than we are, perhaps, but not many. Let us compare our position with that of England and with that of the United States; and let us bear in mind that it was not always so; that Canada started on the race of national life very lightly burthened, indeed, by comparison with other countries. Now, I have never contended, I do not now contend, that it is possible to avoid all increases as a country grows in population. I am willing to admit, that as the country increases in population, a very considerable increase of expenditure is necessary and legitimate. But, Sir, I

ask
of t
her
sho
000
\$12
dia
4,30
4,31
to th
000
ad
bare
had
ticn
our
near
we
mou
whic
of th
does
whil
per
crea

Now
cann
say t
most
this
out
caus
coun
creas
popu
the C
vaga
corru
rema
may
ment
cond
impo
we s
great
of ou
I wa
to th
of Ch
posit

ask the House is this a reasonable state of things? In 1867, Canada commenced her career with a total population, as shown by the Census Estimate, of 3,375,000. Canada's total taxation then was \$13,500,000. In 1883, deducting Indians, the population is probably about 4,300,000—certainly not more than 4,375,000—and the taxation according to these returns had swollen to \$35,800,000. Our population had increased not quite 1,000,000, or barely 1,000,000; our taxation had increased by \$22,250,000. Our taxation per head in 1867 amounted to \$4; our taxation in 1883 amounted to very nearly \$9 per head—and much more, if we were to take into account the enormous amount of additional taxation to which I have alluded, which is taken out of the pockets of the people, although it does not go into the Treasury. So that, while our population increased about 30 per cent our nominal taxes have increased about 200 per cent.

Abstract Proposition.

Now, I admit that abstract propositions cannot always be depended on. But I say that in matters financial you can almost certainly, with safety, lay down this proposition: that whenever, without war or some other extraordinary cause like that, you find the taxes of a country increasing very rapidly, increasing out of all proportion to its population, you may rest assured that the Government has been grossly extravagant, and in all probability grossly corrupt. And when you find the taxation remain stationary for a term of years, you may feel equally assured that the Government has been honestly and economically conducted. Now, Sir, it is a matter of importance that we should know how we stand by comparison with the two great countries with which we do most of our business and most of our trade. I want to call the attention of the House to the way in which the present position of Canada contrasts with the present position of the people of the United States,

who, like ourselves, have the misfortune, as I conceive, of labouring under an unfair system of taxation. In 1867, I find that the taxation of the United States, from all sources, amounted to about \$396,000,000, their population then being, as nearly possible, 36,000,000, by estimate. Sir, in 1883, the taxation of the United States by the President's Message was \$398,287,000, and the population, by estimate, 54,000,000.

Taxation of the United States.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, as he truly says, is great on averages, so to oblige him I will take the United States averages for 1867, 1868, and 1869, lest he accuse me of taking a particular year, and taking those averages we have this result: At the time that Canada was commencing her national existence, the taxation of the United States was \$10 per head, as nearly as may be. We find, Sir, that the taxation of the United States is now a mere fraction over \$7 per head. We find that in seventeen years the taxation of the United States has sunk from \$10 to \$7 per head—has sunk from about \$50 per family to \$35 per family—and in the same seventeen years the taxation of Canada has risen from \$4 per head, to \$9 a head, and from about \$20 per family to about \$45 per family. If the hon. gentleman wants another comparison, I will take the expenditure for the same years and the results are almost worse. The expenditure of the United States, on the average of those years, appears to have been \$8 per head, while now it is less than \$5 per head. Canada's expenditure in 1867 was \$4 per head; Canada's expenditure is now more than \$7 per head. So that, while the United States have reduced their burthen nearly one-half, Canada's burthen has been nearly doubled in proportion to her population. These are serious considerations, and none the less serious because, in comparing the case of England I find that country, seventeen years ago, the taxation per head amounted to £2 5s. 8d., while the taxation now

is about £2 9s. per head. So that while we in Canada have been adding to our taxation at the rate of about \$5 per head, England was contented with an addition of some 80 cents per head. Now, Sir, can any man say that this is a satisfactory showing? Can any man say, knowing the circumstances of the United States, knowing that they had then just emerged from a great civil war, that they are still burthened with war charges amounting, if I remember right, to \$66,000,000 last year for pensions alone—can any man say that it is a satisfactory thing to the people of Canada to find that the record, as between us and them, is so excessively against us as appears from these figures. It is not a pleasant thing for me to say—I have no doubt it is not a pleasant thing for hon. gentleman to hear—but I have yet to learn that it is our duty to conceal the facts of the case because they grate unpleasantly on the ears of hon. gentlemen opposite. More, Sir, when did all this occur? Did it occur in increases evenly distributed over the seventeen years? Not so, Mr. Speaker.

When Increases Occurred.

These increases all occurred in two periods, one beginning in 1867 and terminating in 1874, and the other beginning in 1879, and extending down to the present time. In those two periods all the increases I have referred to arrived—in those two periods, and those alone. Sir, in years gone by, men were wont to talk of the ignorant impatience of taxation; now-a-days it would be infinitely more to the purpose if our people were persuaded to lay aside their ignorant acquiescence in taxation. Because, if you consider, you will find that these enormous increases of taxation are fraught with great dangers to the future welfare of this Dominion.

Cost to Workingman.

I remember well when my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, we considered this matter, and we had to come

to the conclusion that every dollar of unnecessary expenditure meant, in one way or another, a dollar taken out of the pocket of some man who was earning wages and therefore that every million dollars added to the expenditure, meant practically, that one day's wage was taken from every wage-earner throughout the Dominion. And if as I believe, that be a true and fair statement, let the House bear in mind that in adding this \$22,000,000 to the taxation of Canada in seventeen years, about twenty-two day's wages, to all intents and purposes, have been subtracted from the wage-earning classes of the Dominion, and I say that this is a reason, and a good reason, why my hon. friend always opposed, why he always hesitated, to add to the burthens of the people, to add to the already enormous taxation of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, I say that the condition of the wage-earning classes in Canada to-day is not good. I say that it compares unfavourably with the condition of things in England. In England, as the hon. gentleman knows, or as he ought to know, care is taken to provide that every man who earns less than, say \$2 a day—less than about £150 a year—should be—except his free will and proper motion—exempt from taxation; and it is one of the best features of the English fiscal system that it is so. Here our taxes are so arranged that they press more heavily on the men who are called upon to support their families out of their daily earnings than on any other class in the community; and press, next to them, on the great producing class, the farmers and the lumbermen of this country. Sir, every man knows that the labouring class in this country need more than the same class in other countries. They need more fuel, more food, better shelter; and all these things have been made dearer by the policy of the hon. gentleman. I doubt, if to-day in Canada you can point to anything that is really cheaper than it is on the other side of the Atlantic, except certain kinds of food and land in certain parts of the country. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to know what

I com
absol
of ex
count
into t
a cert
Canad
no les
year
True,
plead
our ge
say, th
is a
mole
tain th
matter
you ca
out tak
ple mon
true un
is infin
of whi
exponer
require
gentlem
were on
domesti
hon. ge
fact tha
applicat
say wha
and I an
were goo
ity that
don mar
year or t
in either
to fail.
position
or elsewh
fact that
ada and f
parties to
to offer.
alone, or
a success
Now, as
and 1885
tieman's
probability
of \$31,000
going to sa

I compute, so far as a judge, to be the absolute loss to the country by his policy of excessive taxation—taking into account, as I have said, not merely what goes into the Treasury, but the amount paid to a certain number of persons throughout Canada—I tell him that I believe it is no less than \$9,000,000 or 10,000,000 a year for the last four or five years. True, Sir, the hon. gentleman may plead that he has saved the necessity of our going into debt thereby. Again I say, this is good so far as it goes; but it is a most wasteful mode of borrowing money. If there is one thing more certain than another, it is this, that no matter on what system taxation is levied, you cannot put into the Treasury without taking out of the pockets of the people more than you put in; and if that is true under an honest revenue system, it is infinitely more true under the system of which the hon. gentleman is the exponent. Moreover, I say, Sir, Canada requires its own capital, and the hon. gentleman might have known that, if it were only from the failure of his own domestic loan the other day. Sir, the hon. gentleman laid some stress on the fact that although that loan failed, other applications had come in to him. Now, I say whatever his motives may have been, and I am not disputing that his motives were good—that in view of the probability that he would have to go on the London market to borrow large sums in a year or two, he committed a huge blunder in either issuing that loan, or allowing it to fail. He has put himself into this position—that when he goes to London or elsewhere to borrow money, the mere fact that he attempted to borrow in Canada and failed, is sure to be used by some parties to depreciate the securities he has to offer. Either he ought to have left it alone, or to have taken pains to make it a success when he did attempt to float it. Now, as to the expenditure for 1884 and 1885, it appears from the hon. gentleman's statements, that we are in all probability committed to an expenditure of \$31,000,000, or thereabouts. I am not going to say what can be done now in the

way of cutting down that expenditure. Probably it could be reduced; but how far I am not in a position to say. But I say this, had my hon. friend beside me remained in power, there was no reason whatever why the expenditure should have exceeded \$25,000,000 or \$25,500,000; and I am perfectly certain that my hon. friend would have contrived to keep it within that limit, which is only \$2,500,000 more than the hon. Minister of Finance declared some years ago was ample to carry on the Government of Canada. And Sir, the proof is this—that whereas my hon. friend, when he went into office, found himself obliged to spend \$23,000,000 a year, and had to meet a host of great and sudden demands aggregating an annual addition to the expenditure of \$2,500,000, he did it without adding more, in the long run, than \$250,000 to the expenditure which he found when he went in. Do not say that my hon. friend beside me had no great public works to carry on. My hon. friend carried on greater public works than the hon. Minister of Railways or his colleagues did. As I said the other night, he has no need to dread a comparison between the works done under his auspices, and those done under the auspices of the hon. Minister of Railways. Sir, if the hon. gentleman wants the details of the expenditures which were incurred by us after the year 1874, I am prepared to give them. I find that my hon. friend was obliged to provide for interest and sinking fund alone, on account of the great public works caused by the engagements of his predecessors, \$1,400,000; for Indians, \$260,000; for Mounted Police, \$135,000; for Prince Edward Island, in consequence of the terms of the Treaty, about \$300,000; for the Post Office Department, \$330,000; and for the Supreme Court, \$50,000; making in all, as nearly as may be, \$2,480,000 additional to the expenditure which he found when he entered into office. Sir, he would have been perfectly justified, under those circumstances, had he gone out with an expenditure of \$26,000,000; instead of that, he went out with an expenditure

of \$23,500,000. Then there was another cause, that is the loss occasioned by reason of the capital which is locked up in manufactures. Now, I agree that this is a matter of estimate. I agree that no absolute statistics can be got. I will simply state what I believe to be the case. Let other hon. gentlemen, who know the facts in their respective localities, and may have better opportunities of ascertaining them than myself, let them state what they believe to be the total quantity of capital which is locked up at present in manufactures, and not returning profits to the owners. Now, I have made some enquiry, and collected all the information in all the quarters I could, and I have come to the conclusion that from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000, perhaps more, are present locked up, unproductively, in manufactures throughout this Dominion. This has been brought about directly by the policy of the hon. gentlemen, and it is the usual result of any increased taxation for the purpose of protection. Now, the hon. gentleman would fain escape the responsibility of all this. The hon. gentleman would have us believe that by his policy of collecting together many thousands of poor workingmen in the cities of this Dominion, he and his Government are not responsible, because, as always happens in these cases, when trade slackens, these poor people are thrown on the streets or compelled to work out for half wages. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman is responsible. I say the direct result of his policy has been to gather together these men, and to keep them in such a position, that a trifling reversal may expose them to want, and throw them on the community for support. I say he is responsible for it; and as we are on this question of Protection, I say that the hon. gentleman, if he be really and sincerely an advocate of Protection, ought to have taken a great deal more pains and care than he has done to extend Protection, not merely to the rich manufacturer, but to the workingmen whom he employs. I say that his conduct with respect to the Factories Act alone shows how little he cared for the

poor employee when the interests of the employee conflicted with those of the rich employer.

Protection for Workingmen.

He had the experience of the United States and the experience of England before him, he had the report of his own Commissioners to guide him; he knew right well that many of the persons employed in manufactories were unfairly dealt with, as they always will be, unless the Government steps in to see that women and children, at any rate, are not pressed and driven beyond their strength. Yet five years after the introduction of his policy, he has not condescended to bring down and give the first reading to the Factory Bill intended to protect these poor creatures. Moreover, I say that those workingmen have good right to complain of the policy of the Government in bringing here, at the public expense and in encouraging to come here, people to compete with them. If you are going to have protection at all, let it be thorough-going; protect the labourer, who needs protection quite as much as the employer; do not allow his wages to be cut down and competitors to be brought here at the public expense to underbid the men who are employed in the subsidized manufactories of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman dwelt at some length on the state of the specially protected industries. I thought he might have remembered that we had long ago pointed out to him that so surely as you protect particular industries, so surely you do confer very great advantages on the men who, so to speak, are on the ground and have control of those industries for the moment; but the inevitable result, when you give these or any men an undue advantage by law, is to bring in a great deal more capital than is required, the ultimate result of which is invariably our production and depression, injury to the workingman and the employee alike. The hon. gentleman has intensified the evil. It is quite true that even when you have the whole world for

a market, depressions will at times occur, but when you try to stimulate production by artificial means in a small community, disasters must happen, and probably will happen at a very early date, as they have in this particular instance. I repeat, in all this, the hon. gentleman has done great injury to the great mass of the manufacturers themselves; I repeat, that that the manufacturers of Canada are hurt when capital is destroyed or locked up, and they are still more hurt when the great bulk of the people, who form their customers, are impoverished. Both those results have accrued from the policy of the hon. gentleman. Now, I observe that the hon. gentleman spoke on this occasion with very much bated breath, as to the magnificent surplus at his disposal. But I cannot quite agree with him even in what he said on that question. He claimed he had \$7,000,000 last year from the increase of ordinary revenue over expenditure, and \$1,000,000 of additional surplus from the sales of land in the North-West; but I failed to hear the hon. gentleman say one word of the \$600,000 or thereabouts which he had spent and charged to capital account for surveys in the North-West, in connection with those very lands. Surely, if he claims \$1,000,000 as additional surplus on the one side, although it properly belongs to capital account, he should deduct the \$600,000 on the other side, which are charged to capital account for the survey of these very lands, a portion of which he has sold. The hon. gentleman's calculations may be correct or they may not, as regards the probable surplus at the end of the year, but one thing is clear, that whereas last year he had a surplus of very nearly \$4,957,000 on the 20th February, he now has an apparent surplus of \$930,000, and no more. Now, if that goes on, as it appears to be going on, during the next few months, it is, to say the least, a matter of doubt whether the hon. gentleman will have any surplus at all. Perhaps it is as well he should not. It is clear the hon. gentleman's surplus tempted him into very unnecessary expenditure and to

incur very undue liabilities; but I point out the fact to the House, because it is right they should understand how very seriously the revenue is being reduced and the expenditure is being increased within the past six or seven months, of which alone we can speak with perfect knowledge. Now I come to a question of the very gravest moment, to which the Government have on various occasions called attention. It is a question on which there is a very great conflict of statement between our own authorities and those of the United States. I might argue justly that Ministers would be estopped, at least some of them, from questioning the authorities of the United States statistics, because they invariably used them, and used them rather harshly, against ourselves, when we were in their place, but I do not regard that as a matter of much importance. What I do regard as of infinite moment, is to ascertain the actual facts of the case; and I propose to do so, not from any American statistics but from our own Census returns and from our own various municipal returns. I have stated that one cause of the depressed condition of this country arose, in my judgment, from the fact that there had been a very large emigration indeed from various parts of this Dominion.

What the Municipal Returns say.

Now we cannot absolutely ascertain all the facts as to all the Provinces, but we can to a very considerable extent, at any rate, as regards the Province of Ontario, and I propose to do so. There we have got a tolerable accurate system of municipal returns, and we find from those, when properly checked, that although we cannot determine absolutely the population at any one moment, we can determine, with very considerable accuracy, the relative increase or decrease in the population, provided we apply the proper checks, by taking not only the number of persons who are returned as of school age but those who actually attended school. At the risk of tiring the House, I must

call attention to the very remarkable statistics which have been produced by the Ontario Government in respect to this point. In 1878, we find there were in Ontario, between the ages of five and sixteen, 492,360 children; in 1879, 494,424; in 1880, there were 489,924; in 1881, 484,214; in 1882, 483,817; and in 1883 about the same number. We find that reported in actual attendance at school there were 467,433, in 1878; in 1879, 467,845; in 1880, 464,395; in 1881, 459,826; in 1882, 457,178. Now, I call the careful attention of the House to this fact that, as I said before, I do not contend that those figures are absolutely correct, but I contend that they are relatively correct. It is impossible to suppose that several thousands of assessors through the country, during these four or five years, men at least, one-half of whom are probably supporters of the hon. gentleman, could have deliberately conspired together to falsify returns, and we are justified therefore in assuming those are relatively correct. What do they prove? They prove that by the test of the children of that age and by the school test, which affords a necessary and useful check, the school population of Ontario, from 1879 to 1882, had decreased by 10,670. Sir, that is a very serious matter. Here we have, first of all, a positive, absolute loss, ascertained in that fashion. We have, besides that, the loss of the natural increase of the population, which is considerable, and which I shall presently compute. We have also the displacement by immigration, be it large or small, because it is quite clear that the population having absolutely decreased, all the people who came in there as immigrants have been absorbed and have failed to make up the loss. Now, Sir, we will see, for these five years, what that amounts to. I find that the natural increase of Ontario, which possessed a population of nearly 2,000,000, according to every rule and according to all the information I could get, ought not to have been less than 40,000 a year. What the immigration into the Province may be can only be estimated, but if there

be any truth whatever in the statistics furnished us by the Department of Agriculture, it cannot have been less than 20,000 in each of those years. So, if you add together, first of all, the positive, ascertained loss, as evidence from the school registers, and the loss of the natural increase, and the loss by displacement measured by the number of the immigrants who came in from year to year, you will find that, in 1879, we lost about 52,000; in 1880 we lost 80,000; in 1881 as many, in 1882, I am happy to say, a smaller number, about 6,000, and probably, as far as we can now ascertain, about 60,000 in 1883. Sir, that makes a total loss, including these three causes—because everybody, I think, will admit that, if the school population has really decreased 10,000, the total population, of which the school population forms a fourth, must also have decreased by four times that number—as total loss for Ontario in these five years of about 334,000. Now, it is quite true that a considerable portion of these people have gone to Manitoba. On looking at the returns brought down by the Minister of Agriculture, I find that up to April, 1881, there were 19,000 persons in Manitoba and the North-West born in Ontario; by the same returns I find that, in 1881, although that is of course including three months prior to 1st of April and, therefore, a little too much, 18,000 appeared to have come from Ontario; in 1882, 32,000—I am taking his own statistics—and, in 1883, we believe about 25,000; in all, not quite 100,000 of these people may be counted as having left Ontario and settled in Manitoba and the North-West. Now, I speak for Ontario alone. I have no pretensions to speak for the depopulation, if it do exist, in Quebec or in the Maritime Provinces, but perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works, who formerly declared that it was a matter of the greatest possible importance to repatriate his countrymen, could speak as to the depopulation of Quebec. I heard an hon. gentleman, I do not know whether he is in the House or not, the member for

Bagot (Mr Dupont), a few nights ago declare that he believed that 500,000 or 600,000 people had gone from Quebec to the United States. I would fain hope that that is altogether too large an estimate; but, if we are to believe that gentleman, if we are to believe the Minister of Public Works, if we are to believe the dignitaries of the church who have made it a matter of comment in their pastorals, a serious depopulation has been going on from Quebec likewise. What would my friends from the Maritime Provinces say? What would the gentlemen from New Brunswick and Prince Edward and Nova Scotia say? Do they or do they not believe that numbers of their fellow-countrymen have left those Provinces within the last few years? I leave it for them to speak. I speak only of what I know; I speak only of what I have reasonable grounds for believing; I pay no attention to foreign statistics; I am basing myself exclusively on our own Census and on the municipal and the school returns of the Province for Ontario. Now, Sir, there are collateral proofs of this fact, and proofs which can hardly be disregarded. I have here a return of nearly 200 towns and villages throughout Ontario. It is perfectly notorious that, during the last ten years, our towns and villages grew much more than the rural districts in which they stood, as a rule. Every man who looks at the Census knows that. Now, what do these returns show? They extend over five years also, from 1878-79 to 1883. Well, they show these rather remarkable facts, that, out of 118 villages in Ontario, averaging about 1,000 souls, 79 were stationary or retrograde, and of the remainder, several had not increased as much as the natural increase would warrant. Of sixty-four towns, averaging 3,000, forty-one were stationary or retrograde, and several of the remainder had not increased as much as the natural increase would warrant. It is quite impossible for us to disregard plain, patent facts like these, which every hon. gentleman who chooses to examine the municip-

pal statistics of Ontario can ascertain for himself, as I have done. But I will give one or two particular instances, which may impress the House more than these general statements. The other day, wishing to ascertain, as nearly as I could, the facts in this matter, I applied to the Mayor of the town of Goderich, the chief town of the constituency of my hon. friend behind me. In 1871, according to the Census, that town had a population of 3,954; in 1878, according to the municipal statistics, it had grown to 4,663; according to the last municipal statistics for 1883, supplied me by the Mayor of that town, it had shrunk in five years from 4,663 to 3,818. Sir, I say that it is a serious matter. Why, the county you yourself represent would furnish another illustration. In 1871, the county of Frontenac, according to the Census, contained 16,300 people; the natural increase ought to have brought that up to 20,000 souls, but, the last Census shows that, instead of 20,000, the population of Frontenac was 14,998. Instead of gaining 3,000, as it should, it had lost about 1,400 souls. For further proof I caused the school population of eight townships in my hon. friend's constituency and my own to be carefully gone over, and here again I must pray the indulgence of the House, because the subject is one of first-rate importance. I find that, in the space of six years, the school population of those eight townships had gone down as follows:—Beginning at 10,180, it had been reduced to 9,600, 9,400, 9,200, 8,600, 8,300, and finally to 7,570. It is possible, of course, that I may be mistaken here, and let me say this, that in this instance, I would be very glad indeed to have it proved that I was mistaken. I would be very glad if the Minister of Finance or any of his friends will show that these statistics which I have referred to to-night are erroneous, and how, and why. So far as I can see, these statistics deserve our respect, if they are properly checked. I have not contended that they are absolutely accurate; I do contend that they are relatively accurate.

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Well, I shall preserve my own opinion until I see much better arguments than have been put in print, at any rate, by the hon. gentleman or any of his deputies. There may be arguments as yet unstated; I am open to conviction, and I shall be glad to hear them. Now, I want to call attention to certain facts connected with the immigration to this country. We have heard these hon. gentlemen declaring that they have brought, I think they said, 130,000 people into Canada within the last year, 112,000 in the year before, and 47,000 in the year before that. Sir, these people may have come. If they have come, then the displacement of our own population in Ontario has been very much greater than I supposed; but I shall presently show the House that, even if these people did come in with the intention of settling here, it is, to say the least of it, an exceedingly questionable matter whether they have stayed in Canada. Now, Sir, we have no absolute proof as to what has become of the men who have arrived since our last census, but we have tolerably convincing evidence as to what became of the immigrants who came into Canada during the decade between 1871 and 1881. Sir, I find, on looking at the returns of the Census that the foreign born population in 1881, was 609,000; I find that Ontario, in 1881, had 429,000 foreign-born population, while in 1871 it had 442,000. I find that in the four old Provinces in 1871, quoting from the Census, the foreign-born population was 593,000; in 1881 in the four old Provinces, it was 566,000. Now, Sir, I call attention to these facts. According to our immigration returns, 342,575 people have settled in Canada, as these returns allege, between 1871 and 1881. Now, I will allow as large a percentage for death rate as you can ask; I will allow, say for 120,000 deaths of foreign population, and what is the result? Why, Sir, we find that had those 342,000 people settled here, we ought to have had at least 222,000 more foreign population in the

Dominion, in the four old Provinces, in 1881; instead of that we have 27,000 less; so that it follows, beyond possibility of controversy, according to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, that of the 342,000 who were said to have come and settled in Canada, not 90,000 have stayed. I suspect that the same result would come out, even if the figures are maintained in respect to the 112,000 or the 180,000 whom the hon. gentleman asserts to have settled in Canada of late. Now this is a very serious matter; I say the absolute loss to us is extreme.

Value of Canadian Emigrants.

It is hardly possible to estimate sufficiently the value of the emigrants who leave Canada. First of all, a very large proportion of those who leave us, as every man of us can see who chooses to inspect an ordinary train leaving Canada, consists of men in their prime. In the next place, it is notably the fact, as far as Ontario is concerned, that almost all the men who leave Canada to seek homes elsewhere are possessed of very considerable capital. I believe, Sir, if a fair average was taken, it would be found that each one takes in money, and money's worth, nearer \$2,000 than \$1,000 from this country. I know in the few cases concerning which I have taken the trouble to ascertain the facts, I have been astonished at the enormous amount of capital which was being removed from Canada to seek investment elsewhere. Now, Sir, what is the value of these men as compared with that of ordinary immigrants? Sir, I have no prejudice against immigrants. We can welcome all good, industrious immigrants, although we do not wish to see immigrants coming here unless they are prepared to better their condition; but, Sir, I say, in no spirit of prejudice, that one Ontario farmer, one Canadian farmer, possessed of reasonable capital, is worth, either as a tax-payer or as a producer, any half dozen foreign immigrants who may come into this country. I scorn to put a money value on my countrymen, although the

American people are in the habit of calling every able-bodied immigrant worth \$1,000 to the public; but, Sir, I decline to rate our brethren at so much a head. Still I do say that those men who leave Canada in that way take away with them, and take from us, a most important element of national wealth and a most enormous amount of the capital of Canada. And these gentlemen want to arrogate to themselves that they are the only friends of Canada. Their policy, they tell us, is a policy of "Canada for the Canadians."

What are the facts, as disclosed in the United States Census for 1881? Why, Sir, they show that 700,000 Canadians were then found in the United States, and I believe that if the census were taken to-day, it would show the number of Canadians in the United States to be nearer 1,000,000 than 700,000. Sir, it is no wonder the people of Dakota have a high opinion of the Premier, and are fond of declaring that Dakota needs no land agent while the present Premier of the Dominion has control of affairs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to deny that this has gone on for a long time, but I think it has gone on with a vastly accelerated ratio since the hon. gentlemen came into power and introduced their present policy. Our own Census, as I have shown, proves conclusively, first of all, that the foreign immigrants who come here do not stay here, and next, that the total increase of the population hardly equals the natural increase to which we are entitled. More, what is true of Ontario is true also—I do not want in the least degree to disguise the fact—of the New England States, and to a great extent it is true of the State of New York. But, Sir, there is this all-important difference: when the New Englander, or the New Yorker, quits his parental home and goes westward, he does not cease to be a citizen of the United States, and to contribute to its wealth and importance; but when our people leave the older Provinces, the majority of them, I am sorry to say, do not find homes within the Dominion, but they go to swell the importance, the strength and the wealth

of the people of the United States. A few weeks ago, I was conversing with a very intelligent gentleman, the editor of a large new paper in the western part of Canada, and I asked that gentleman to examine his list and tell me how many subscribers he then had in the United States. After examining his list, he showed me that he had 800 subscribers who had formerly been inhabitants of Canada, but who, within the last two or three years, had become inhabitants of the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. Please name the paper.

Sir, RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The name of the paper is the *Expositor*, of Seaforth, and if the hon. gentleman chooses to go and visit the editor, I have no doubt he will show him his list. Now, I do not deny that the drain of capital may, to a certain extent, be balanced. It is true we get back, in the shape of immigrants and the capital they bring, a certain percentage, but it is a most disadvantageous in exchange to us. We give the very best, the prime of our population, and we do not by any means get the best, nor is it at all a prime population that comes to us. Sir, if it be true, that of 342,000 immigrants who came within the last decade, only 90,000 at the outside, have remained with us—and I see no answer to these statistics that I have taken from the returns made by the Department of Agriculture and from the Census—if that be true, what impolicy it is on our part to bring these people here, to pay their passage, to have them come to Canada, and then leave Canada and report that they could not make a living here, and had to go elsewhere. Sir, I say our whole immigration system requires revising, from the top to the bottom, and I believe it would be better for us all if we adopted the policy of the United States. Diffuse information if you will, but certainly do not bring people here, as we have been doing, to compete with our own labourers in many of the walks of life, when, in all probability, three-fourths of them will find their way to the United States.

and send word to their friends and relatives in England that they had tried Canada and could not obtain a living in it. Well, Sir, all this was bad enough in past times. But in past times there was an excuse for it. In past times, it was true, we had not practically at our disposal a great quantity of land, on which those people might be settled. It is utterly inexcusable now. Sir, a few years ago a most extraordinary opportunity was presented to the Government of Canada.

A Great Opportunity.

It was one of those great opportunities which come but once in a century, and I may say, once in the lifetime of a nation. It was an opportunity, given to those hon. gentlemen, by which they might have fully redeemed all their other errors and blunders, and they were neither few nor far between. I have never contended that the fiscal policy of a nation is more than one factor in its progress. I admit, frankly that such things have happened as that a prudent and economical administration has been combined with a very bad fiscal system. I admit it is possible we may have a good land policy and a bad fiscal system. Those hon. gentlemen a few years ago, came into office to find substantially all the essential work done for their hands. Thanks to the patient toil of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) for five years, one great avenue to the North-West was all but opened. Thanks, to do them justice, to the enterprise and energy of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway Company, another avenue had been opened for some time. That magnificent country was practically placed at their disposal. The people of Canada, and notably the people of Ontario were most anxious to go there. All the pent-up energies of many years were seeking an outlet. Every man who knows our people is aware that for years back we had been looking for such a field for energy and capital as the North-West then presented. The men were there, the money was there. Outside capital

was ready to aid them to any reasonable extent. Absolutely, all that was necessary was to leave that country alone and let the people develop it. And, absolutely, they could not even do that. The very best settlers in the world were flowing into Manitoba. I never in all my life saw men so thoroughly capable of, and so well calculated for developing a country as the settlers who were going from Ontario to Manitoba in the early years of the hon. gentleman's Administration. I say they chose deliberately to ruin everything. I say that was bad if done from ignorance; if done from any other motive, it was an iniquitous breach of trust.

Requirements of the North-West

What were the requirements of the North-West? They were three. First, the people needed cheap land; second, cheap goods; and third, and most of all, cheap and abundant means of transportation. How did hon. gentlemen supply these wants? Do not hon. members know that every vexatious obstacle and impediment that could be conceived in the way of land regulations was placed in the way of intending settlers? Large tracts of land were withheld from settlers—the very tracts which the people desired to enter upon. Faith was broken with them in every possible way; their small capital was reduced by heavy and excessive taxation, and all opportunity of getting cheap transportation, although the people were prepared to provide it at their own cost, was shut out. Two policies were possible. One was to construct a road as a Government road, run it cheaply for the first few years, so as barely to pay expenses, and adopt a liberal policy for side lines, a policy substantially the same as that which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) proposed to introduce, and which would have contributed enormously to the wholesome development of the North-West, if put in force either by those hon. gentlemen or by the late Parliament. Then there was the other plan: to allow the utmost freedom of competition, as was

the right of the people of the North-West, provided the Government did not choose to construct the road and run it in the way I have described. What did they do? They forbade all competition, and as soon as the Government road was constructed, they handed it over to a private corporation; they not only turned it over, but they resigned all control over it. No grosser outrage was ever committed on a free people than that which was committed by the Government and Parliament of Canada in thus interfering with the plainest rights of the people of the North-West. I say, moreover, that there never was such a case of sacrificing ends to means as in that act. What use is the Canadian Pacific Railway to us? Why should we be burdened with the payment of \$100,000,000 for it, but for the opportunity presented of providing homes for hundreds of thousands of our people who are asking them at our hands? What hon. gentlemen opposite have done has been to deprive those people of the chance of settlement, to take away from them every possible inducement to go there. And the secondary results have been almost more important still. I remember well the position of the country in 1880. At that time, all kinds of railway projects were in agitation, and there was this remarkable feature about them. In old Canada it is not an easy task to devise railways which will prove profitable until after a long term of years. Very often the country opened up is of an inferior character and not likely to secure immediate settlement. But in the North-West it was scarcely possible for a man of ordinary judgment to plan a railway which would not in all human probability have brought in a large number of settlers and have become a reasonable source of profit to the promoters, within a short space of time. As I have said no better settlers could be imagined than those who were rushing in from Ontario. There was perfect readiness on the part of outside capitalists to co-operate; and moreover, such branch lines as were proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell, when he was Minister of the

Interior, would really have been the best of all colonization schemes. The companies would not have been given, nor did the hon. gentleman propose to allow them absolute control of the land, it was to have been retained under the control of the Government, and it would have been only profitable to the Company when they succeeded in placing actual settlers upon it. But all their projects were paralyzed by law. The right to construct such roads was taken away. What was the result? There was at once a complete stoppage of the influx of the best settlers; they would not go to a country where their rights were trampled on in that fashion. Capital that stood ready to develop that country, which its owners would have only been too happy to have invested in this manner, being thus debarred from its natural outlet, was directed into other channels, and there have been scenes in Manitoba and the North-West the like of which has scarcely been exceeded since the days of the South Sea Bubble. Moreover, all the branch lines which might have been and would have been constructed were utterly abandoned. No man could venture to build railways in face of the conditions on which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were entitled to build their line. The whole country was plunged into a state of discontent of which hon. gentlemen opposite are very far indeed from having heard the last.

What Might have Been.

Now, Sir, had they acted otherwise, had they acted sensibly and prudently, had they allowed the people to do what the people were only too ready to do to-day, instead of having a paltry 150,000, or thereabouts, of people, strung along 1,000 miles of railway, we would have had, in all human probability, 500,000 settlers in Manitoba alone we would have had from 2000 to 3000 miles of branch lines in active operation and we would have been able, in place of the miserable export we now have, to have exported, in all human probability at least 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, in this very year. Sir, the

Canadian Pacific Railway itself would have had an infinitely better chance of success than it has to-day. Instead of its being a costly, a hazardous and a doubtful experiment that railway with such a Province to draw from would have stood infinitely higher than it does to-day, with all the backing which the hon. gentleman can give it. Now, Sir, it does not lie in the mouth of these gentlemen to say that I exaggerate when I assert that we might to-day, in 1884 or 1883, have had an export of 20,000,000 bushels of grain from that country. Did not the Minister of Railways himself say that he hoped to see an export of 600,000,000 bushels of grain produced by the 100,000 settlers who would soon be settled in that country? I will not say that even this was an extravagant or an extreme view of the case, but I do say that but for the most unwise interference of the Government which prevented the people from the direct railway communication which they would otherwise have got, it is perfectly certain that there would have been 20,000 settlers in Southern Manitoba to-day who would have been in a position in all likelihood to have exported the quantity of grain I named. It has been done elsewhere. I am not speaking of an impossibility, but of a thing which has been done again and again in the United States, close beside us. Now, it is well for us to consider how all this came about. I am sorry the First Minister is not here, because to a very considerable extent I hold him directly responsible for the miscarriage. I certainly am not a blind idolator of the hon. gentleman, but I know him well, and I appreciate many of his qualities quite as much, perhaps, as hon. gentlemen opposite do. I admit that the hon. gentleman is a good technician, that he is a wire-puller of the first force, but I say that the hon. gentleman has never either now or in former years shown himself to be a good and capable administrator. Out of his own mouth let me convict him. No man was louder or more outspoken in his condemnation of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) because he propos-

ed at one and the same time to act as Premier of Canada and to take charge of a Department of the Government. But the hon. gentleman, when he entered office, took into his hands the charge of by far the most important Department of the Government, in conjunction with the task of performing the duties of Premier. Sir, he may have attended to his duties as Premier, but no other evidence is required than his own declaration on the floor of the House, when he was endeavouring to pass the Estimates through Parliament, to show that he did not attend to the duties of his Department. And in this very city, as I am informed, a few months ago, when cross-examined on oath, he declared that though he was sworn to discharge the duties of Minister of the Interior, he knew nothing at all about the conduct of the most important branch of his own Department. I am glad that since that declaration he has ceased to hold that office, for no matter what a man may be on matter what his talents may be, I say that he could not possibly discharge the duties of Minister of the Interior, unless he originally possessed, or immediately after entering office, he took pains to acquire an intimate personal knowledge of that country. And I say it is a great misfortune to Canada, and probably to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the First Minister should have, during all that time, chosen to occupy the position of Minister of the Interior. Now, Sir, one word as to the demands of the people of the North-West. Sir, I am heartily in sympathy with them; I say that those demands are substantially just. I say that it is in the highest degree in the interests of the Dominion of Canada that they should be conceded without delay. And as I have done before, I warn the Government, and so far as I can, I warn the people of Canada that unless they accede to the just demands of the people of the North-West, they will only have their own obstinacy and folly to thank for it, if the day should come, though I hope it never may, when Canada may lose the North-West, which it has so persistently

discouraged. Sir, I utterly repudiate the idea that the people of the North-West are under any obligation or compliment to the people or the Parliament of Canada. On the contrary, I say the Parliament and Government of Canada have most grievously oppressed and maltreated the people of the North-West. Now, Sir, it may be that the lock-up of capital there is the smallest injury which Canada has sustained—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him to state what those just claims of the North-West are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will tell the hon. gentleman. I say that the tyrannical monopoly should be abolished; that reasonable and fair, and just land regulations should be given and acted upon, and not changed from day to day and from hour to hour, at the caprice of a Minister at Ottawa, who knows and can know nothing about the interests of that country, who has never condescended to set his foot there—I mean, of course, the late Minister of the Interior—who never even condescended to go as far west as Chicago, who never, I believe, has put his foot on prairie soil in his life, either in Canada or anywhere else. If hon. gentlemen want to know more of these demands let them look at what the North-West council, nominees, many of them of the hon. gentleman, as to what the claims of the North-West on the people of Canada are. I was stating, Sir, that perhaps the lock-up of capital was the smallest injury, but that is great enough. Few of us perhaps know how widespread has been the desire of the people of Ontario, in particular, to acquire property in the North-West. I doubt if you could find a single hamlet in which there are not a considerable number of people who have some money in the North-West. I was at pains at Winnipeg and Toronto, and elsewhere, to make a number of enquiries as to the amount of capital locked up there, and I believe I am largely within the mark in saying that, in all human probability, more than \$20,000,000, within the last three or four

years, have been locked up in the North-West. I do not say that all that money is lost, though no doubt a good deal of it has been lost; but I say that it is locked up and fixed, and that to all intents and purposes it is locked up to the people of Canada for the time being, and, therefore, one considerable cause of the stringency and depression which, as I contend, does undoubtedly exist here now. Moreover, I say the House should not suppose that it is as easy to undo the evil we have done as to do it.

Seed Time thrown Away.

Sir, the seed time has been thrown away, and years must elapse before we find ourselves in one half as favourable a position for developing the North-West as we were in a few years ago. The money is gone or locked up as I have said—the men have gone too, which is worse.

Where Our People go.

And if hon. gentlemen want to know where they have gone, I can tell them where part of them have gone. Let them go to northern Dakota, and they will find that in one whole division of that State, about 150 miles in length by 60 miles in depth, nine-tenths of the population in that district are composed of Canadians, a very large number of whom, I grieve to say, went to Manitoba first, and afterwards crossed the border. Sir, if hon. gentlemen want to know what that means, I say that the area I have described would equal one-half of the whole western peninsula of Ontario. Draw a line from Toronto through London to Lake Huron and all the country south of that line, including twenty-three of the best Ridings of Canada—an area equalling the counties of Essex, Kent, Lambton, Bothwell, the Elgins, the Norfolks, the Middlesexes, Welland, Haldimand, the Wentworths, the Brants, the Oxfords, Monk, Lincoln, Halton and Peel, would barely equal the territory of Northern Dakota, which is now occupied by Canadians who sought homes in Manitoba and—thanks to the

policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—were unable to find them there. Sir, I said there was also another loss. The hon. gentleman has added intentionally or not—but he has added largely, despite what he may say to the contrary, to the cost of living in this country. The hon. gentleman knows—if he tries to retrench, he will soon find out if he does not know—that it is very hard, indeed, for either nations or individuals, who have become accustomed to a certain style of expenditure, to retrench that expenditure. Sir, I say any wise statesman to-day would shun, as he would shun poison, any legislation which would tend to increase the wealth of the few at the expense of the impoverishment of the many. I say that there is no greater danger, politically speaking, confronting society than the aggregation of large fortunes in individual hands; and the hon. gentleman, if he pays any attention to the movements of current thought, knows, or ought to know that I speak the truth. I say that it is a thing which invariably produces corruption on the one side and misery on the other. I say it justifies socialism. We, in Canada, a few years ago, if we had not great wealth, had an exceedingly fair distribution of what wealth we had.

For What Ministers are Responsible.

The hon. gentleman's policy has contributed largely to alter that condition of things, and to cause this country to approximate the very condition in the Old World which has led so many people to leave the Old World and seek a home on this side of the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman can show no single instance anywhere, in which huge fortunes exist in which there is not intense poverty at the other end of the scale. Now, let us see what the hon. gentlemen opposite can be held responsible for. For the poor harvest they are not responsible in one sense, inasmuch they certainly could not avert it; although I say they are responsible in this sense, that when bad harvests overtook the country, during the Administration of my hon. friend,

they falsely charged him with being the cause of it, and falsely pretended that if they were put in office they could do better. I say they are responsible for the excessive taxation which exists, for the amount of capital which is needlessly locked up in unproductive manufactures for the capital which is lost by emigration which is very large, for the capital which is locked up in the North-West, and for the general inflation and the increased cost of living in the country. Now, how do these hon. gentlemen propose to remedy all this? I did not hear in the statement of the hon. gentleman, any relief proposed now. He takes credit to himself that he was obliged to reduce certain taxes. Well, Sir, considering that he put on probably twelve or fifteen millions more taxes per annum, than were at all required, I do not think we owe him any great thanks for that. Still, as far as it went, it was good; but it was not by any manner of means what he ought to have done or what is called for by the present necessities of the country. Now, I had thought that I might take this occasion to speak of the Administration and the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) more in detail; but that, I see, looking at the time, I must reserve for some other occasion. Still, I will say this, that I am prepared to show, if the hon. gentleman wants to have it shown, that the deficits which existed during my hon. friend's Administration—the deficits of 1876, 1877 and 1878—were due to the extravagance—aye, to the deliberate misconduct—of his predecessors. I say Sir, that the deficits which would have existed in 1874 and 1875 were turned into surpluses by us. I say more—that the mischief which afterwards occurred was due to the neglect, by hon. gentlemen opposite, of my hon. friend's warnings, and I say, that in spite of all, we had substantially mastered all those difficulties by sheer economy, and that, with the solitary exception of the sum required for sinking fund—which, as the hon. Minister of Finance truly said this afternoon goes wholly to the redemption of debt we had, before we left office, succeeded in establishing an equilibrium. More

I say—our Tariff, had it been maintained, would have provided an ample revenue the moment trade revived. The Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, as the statements of 1879 and 1880 show, wholly failed to afford a revenue until that revival took place. I say further—if, instead of having recourse to a comparison of my hon. friend's Administration in difficult times, with their Administration in prosperous times, hon. gentlemen opposite compare their Administration in a time at all approaching the stringency we had to face, my hon. friend has not the faintest cause to fear a comparison of his Administration with the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald in former years of stringency. More, Sir—I say that our policy prevailed the taxes and the expenditure of the country would have been many millions a year less to-day than they are now, and the taxation would have been infinitely more fairly levied. I say, as I have said before, that had the people been permitted, as we would have permitted them, to use the great advantages which presented themselves in Manitoba, that Province to-day would have contained half a million of prosperous and contented settlers, instead of being as the hon. gentleman well knows a mass of discontent. I say there would have been no tyrannical monopolies; and although there would have been undoubtedly a considerable removal from Ontario, that would have gone to swell the population of our country, and not the population of the United States. Now, Sir, in all this I am not claiming very much. I am only claiming that affairs would have been administered with reasonable prudence, and reasonable economy, and reasonable discretion; and I say, that as much as could have been done in Manitoba, has been done again and again in the United States. Now, Sir, I do not want, as the hon. gentlemen did, to enter on the realm of prophecy; I am not going to venture on any predictions. But I may recall the past. I may recall the fact that, in 1873, under somewhat similar circumstances, the hon. gentleman thought there was a long career

of prosperity awaiting us; and I may recall to him the fact that, scarcely were the words out of his mouth, as scarcely were the words out of his mouth last year, before the fair prospect was overclouded. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman has a period of commercial difficulty before him—though I trust he will not be called upon to face any such commercial disaster as overtook the country during the Administration of my hon. friend—I ask him, and I ask the House, how he is prepared to meet it. Sir, our resources have been dissipated, while our liabilities have been indefinitely increased. It is quiet on the cards, if the hon. gentleman's own policy should be carried out, and our imports should be reduced to the level of exports, that instead of having \$30,000,000 or \$31,000,000 to rely on, he might find himself reduced to \$26,000,000 or \$27,000,000; while at the same time he has swollen his expenditure to such a figure that there is scarcely any reasonable ground for believing that it can be reduced below \$30,000,000 or \$31,000,000. Now we have to confront, not only this grievous taxation, but an absolute reduction in the population of our richest Province, and there is this difference, at any rate, between the trouble which may overtake us now and the trouble which overtook us in 1874, that although it may be true that in both cases something was due to the extravagance of the people themselves, though more is due, I think, to unavoidable misfortunes, which could not by any possibility be foreseen or prevented, still in the present instance when there have been no disasters of any real importance, we have nothing to thank but our own wilful imprudence for the position we are in to-day. We have nothing to thank but our own folly if the advantages of our position have been thrown away and prove insufficient to save us from serious reverses. Now, if I am to sum up the losses we have sustained, I feel some difficulty in doing it. I believe the excessive taxation to which the hon. gentleman has subjected this country, has involved a loss of not less than \$50,000,000 in the course of the last five years; I

believe that the locking up of capital in manufactures has involved a loss of not less than \$10,000,000, and the locking up of capital in the North-West, a loss of not less than \$20,000,000. As to the loss we have sustained by the depletion of our population and the amount of capital withdrawn from Canada to provide Canadians with homes in the United States, that, I confess, I almost hesitate to compute. I know it to be very large and vastly in excess of all we have received from any immigration into this country, but how large it is, it is almost impossible for me or anybody else to calculate now. The hon. gentleman, besides by involving us, as he has, in an annual expenditure of not less than \$30,000,000 a year, has unjustly and improperly added \$5,000,000 to our annual expenditure. Let him capitalize that at 4 per cent. and see what amount that will represent. I say nothing of the additional millions which have not been paid into the Treasury but have been paid in subsidizing certain industries in this country. I will only allude to the hundreds of millions in money and other subsidies which we have granted to a Company for the purpose of creating a railway monopoly through the North-West. We do not know if the \$100,000,000 will do or what further demands will be made. I have put down nothing for the last bad harvest, the shrinkage of stocks, the loss we have incurred, according to the hon. gentleman's principles, by the fact that our imports exceeded our exports last year by \$30,000,000 or \$34,000,000. If hon. gentlemen opposite choose to add all these things together, they may compute for themselves; they may compute what four or five years of those hon. gentlemen's Government has cost the country. For myself, I will not hesitate to say that, looking at the thing all round, I believe we would have done better if we had borrowed \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000 and thrown the money into the sea or blown it away in fireworks, as other nations have done, than allow these hon. gentlemen to control the Administration of this country.

What Five Years of Sir J. Macdonald's Administration have done.

Five years of their government have done as much mischief to Canada, relatively to our population and resources, as four years of civil war did to the country and the people to the south of us. But though we may measure the material injury we have sustained, how shall we estimate the moral? I predicted in 1878, that if the people of Canada chose to restore those hon. gentlemen to power, three results would accrue. First of all, I said, and I repeat it now, that by restoring those hon. gentlemen to power, after what they had been proved to have done, we would degrade and demoralize public opinion from one end of this country to the other. I said, in the second place, that by the system they proposed to introduce, if allowed to put it into effect, they would impoverish the great bulk of the people. I said, in the last place, that if they were restored to power, after what had occurred, all restraint and wholesome control on the part of the people, over Parliament or the Government, would be removed, and that there would be no check on the extravagance and corruption which would ultimately prevail. I am sorry to say that the worst results I predicted have been fulfilled. We are confronted to-day with a Government which may be defined as a Government compacted of all the sinister interests in Canada. It is not, as its leader once said, a Government steeped to the lips in corruption, but a Government which is corruption incarnate. What have we seen within the last two weeks, within the last few days? What have we seen within the course of the last year or two? We have seen the whole representation of the Great Province to which I belong so villainously gerrymandered that one half of the electors are allowed to return two-thirds of the representatives to Parliament; that one-sixth of the people, to all intents and purposes, are practically disfranchised, and we saw that done by virtue of a Census which itself is a deliberate fraud and as to which you can only assert with confidence one fact, that it does not truly state the number of

people who were in Canada on the day it pretended to be taken. We have seen worse than that. We have seen civil servants of Government, who were proven to have conspired to defraud, or who, at any rate, were proven to have aided in causing their employers a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars, restored to office and the act defended on the floor of this House; we have seen the judiciary prostituted by the appointment to a place on the Bench of a gentleman against whom suits were impending which, if proven, would have shown him to be utterly unfit to take his seat on that very Bench before which these actions were brought; we have seen contracts for large sums of money given away in deliberate violation of the law and in a fashion that justified the idea that the men who got the contracts were expected to render yeoman's service, by providing secret funds for electoral corruption, we have seen large tracts of valuable lands, the property of the public, secretly sold for about one-third of their value to the highest officials of the country, and not a word heard in reprobation from the gentlemen who used to be so loud in denouncing my hon friend (Mr. Mackenzie) if it were discovered that he, on any occasion, had allowed a contract to be given to one man for a few hundred dollars more than it had been tendered for by another; we have seen two Premiers, one of the Dominion and one the great Province of Québec, unseated for shameless bribery and corruption, committed under circumstances which show that, if not legally, they were morally guilty of acting in connivance with the culprits; we have seen one great Province brought to the brink of financial ruin by the extravagance and corruption of those entrusted with its administration, to its great loss and the loss of the whole Dominion; we have seen other Provinces repeatedly deprived of their just and legal rights, in defiance of the former public declarations of the very men who vetoed those laws passed by the Provincial Legislatures; we have seen a deliberate plot on the part of the Federal Govern-

ment, by means I shall not characterize, as they deserve to be characterized, to overturn the Local Government in Ontario. Sir, it failed, as it deserved to fail, and in this failure there is, perhaps, the best ground for hope that the people of Canada and the people of Ontario are beginning to understand and appreciate the mode in which those hon. gentlemen are carrying on the Government of this country. We have seen hundreds of thousands of the very choice and flower of our fellow-countrymen driven into exile by the policy of these hon. gentlemen; we have seen \$100,000,000, of public money given to build up a railway monopoly; we have seen the taxation of this country raised to a point far beyond the taxation of the United States to-day and equal to that with which the United States emerged from their great civil war; and we have seen all that done under a fiscal policy, for which the hon. gentleman is specially responsible, which is so contrived as to bear most heavily on the poorest portion of the community, next most heavily on the producing classes, and, by an exquisite refinement of folly, most of all and worst of all, on the very men who are now engaged in endeavouring to settle, to develop, and to make valuable the country to the north-west of us. Still do not despair, bad as all this is, I do not despair. In one thing I agree with the hon. gentleman—the resources of this country are great. Other countries have sustained equal injuries and have survived them not without bitter suffering, but they have survived them, and I believe the resources of Canada are enough; I believe there is enough sterling honesty and ability among our people, if properly organized, to restore an honest form of Government yet. But, although I do not despair, I am not over-confident. I am aware that mischief has been done which it will take generations to repair; I am aware that the whole future of this country has been very heavily mortgaged indeed, and I do not cheat myself with the cheap philosophy that everything is bound to come all right somehow. Reason

does not tell us that, history does not tell us that, experience does not tell us that. It may be that things will come right, but they will not come right of their own accord; they will have to be set right, and it may be after a long and painful struggle. More, Sir; I say it with regret, but I say that the people of Canada have deliberately retrograded; I say that the people of Canada have not shown, as a whole, that regard for their liberty, that jealous watchfulness of men in power, that is the price that every free nation must pay for being properly governed. I say that to-day, in Canada to our shame and loss be it said, public morality is painfully low and public opinion is painfully weak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; I say it. I am not afraid to say it. Our duty is plain enough, and we mean to do it. Our duty is not to shrink from telling unpleasant truths because we happen to stand at odds on this floor. We may be at the odds of one or two; we are at the odds of one to two, although our numbers here do not at all represent fairly and honestly our true following in this country. But I say this, be the odds what they will, so as we have seats here, we will not cease to warn the people of their danger, we will not cease to call those hon. gentlemen to account, Sir, the hon. gentlemen have power indeed, they may have recourse to their old style of argument, they

cannot answer our arguments perhaps, but they can pass Acts of Parliament to turn us out of the Legislature. That they can do, and that if they choose to try it again, they are welcome to do; but, except by such arguments, they will not silence gentlemen on this side of the House; they will not silence them by any impudent assertions on their part that they are patriotic, and that we are to be denounced because we choose to call attention to plain and manifest facts. Was that the way in which the hon. Minister of Railways used to conduct his opposition from this very seat? Was he afraid of stating unpleasant facts because he thought it might injure the credit of this country? If he concealed anything, Mr. Speaker, his concealment was the highest style of art, for no one on our side ever suspected him of doing it. I regret exceedingly that things are as they are, but I say it would be infinitely worse if, being as they are, we should hesitate to declare our opinion. I admit that we may be out-voted and that we may be out-numbered, but what I say to my friends behind me is, that so long as they are true to their own convictions, and so long as they are not afraid to defend them here and to defend them elsewhere, the Liberal party may, here in Canada, as it is has elsewhere, be temporarily defeated, but the Liberal party cannot be beaten, and the Liberal party are safe to win in the end.